Vol. X, No. 11 HUMAN EVENTS March 18, 1953

THE IDIOCY OF WORLD GOVERNMENT

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

MAR 26 '53

ADVOCACY OF WORLD GOVERNMENT is one of the principal escapist diseases of our time. It is especially virulent in academic circles. A clinical diagnosis reveals that the following categories of individuals are especially liable to the infection.

Former hotspur crusaders of World War II, unwilling to face up to the total bankruptcy of a war that started out to make a new heaven and a new earth and ended by leaving the United States in greater danger than it was at the height of Hitler's power.

Individuals with an acute American guilt complex who feel that there is something wrong and sinful about capitalism in general and the relatively high American standard of living in particular, and who pant for some scheme of giving away a large share of America's substance to the "underprivileged" peoples of the world.

Persons who are still bemused with Wendell Willkie's slick and empty slogan, "One World".

Those who, for various reasons, wish to divert American attention from the supreme political fact of the second half of the twentieth century. This is the threat, to the whole fabric of western civilization, posed by the existence of a gigantic Communist empire, stretching from the Baltic to the Pacific and avowedly committed to the principle that there can be no permanent peace until the world is Communized.

People who seek quick and miraculous cures for hard problems. Principal organization for promoting the World Government idea is the United World Federalists, an organization which claimed almost fifty thousand members in 1949. Persons prominently identified with this organization are Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, Raymond Gram Swing, Robert E. Sherwood, Norman Cousins and Cord Meyer.

The program of United World Federalists calls for "a world federal government, universal and strong enough to prevent armed conflict between nations, and having direct jurisdiction in those matters within its authority", and for the transformation of the United Nations into such a world federal government. At a conference of atomic scientists, publicists and political figures at Winter Park, Florida, in 1946 Justice Douglas said: "Our

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

goal should be a world government representing the peoples of the world, functioning under an international bill of rights through a legislature, judiciary and executive."

And a group of heavy thinkers, mostly associated with the University of Chicago, under the leadership of former Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins, framed a constitution for world government. There is little prospect that this document will ever be put into operation. And this is perhaps just as well, because its provisions are so complicated that only college professors — who under the Binet-Simon test would be at least two hundred years old — could hope to understand it.

An apostle of world government, a businessman named Robert Humber, at one time persuaded more than a score of state legislatures to endorse the idea, although some of these bodies have subsequently rescinded their action on sober second thought.

DOES WORLD GOVERNMENT, as some sincere, well meaning people believe and hope, offer a way out of the world's present state of chronic acute high tension, a solution for the threat of war, an alternative to the cost and danger of heavy national armaments? Or is the idea a mirage and a hoax, a piece of sheer political idiocy, which bears not the slightest relation to the realities and possibilities of the world in which we are living? I think the overwhelming weight of evidence is for the second proposition.

The first point to be noted is that about one third of the human race (the combined population of the Soviet Union, China, the East European satellite states and North Korea) would, on any rational calculation, have to be counted out of any world government scheme in advance. The philosophy of Communism is no secret. The Communist conspiracy is one of the most open in history.

Anyone moderately familiar with the writings of Lenin and Stalin knows that Soviet Communism is committed to the theory of implacable opposition between the interests of Communist and non-Communist states. The only solution for this dilemma, in the Communist view, is the conquest of the whole world for Communism by force and subversion.

Quite logically and, indeed, inevitably, given this assumption, Soviet foreign policy has consistently rejected the slightest external restraint on the freedom of the Soviet Government to do as it pleases. The Soviet Government has signed no agreements for peaceful arbitration of disputes. It has never been willing to acknowledge the authority of the International Court at the Hague. Its record in the United Nations is one long series of "Nyets".

There is, therefore, not the slightest prospect that the Soviet Government, which speaks not only for itself, but for a long array of vassal states, would consent to the pooling of sovereignty that would be necessary under the most limited form of world govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. And Soviet striking power is the sole threat of big war, the sole reason for what would in former times have been considered the excessive military preparations of the United States. A world government which did not include the Soviet Union (as it certainly would not) could not add an iota to American security or subtract a penny from the American defense budget.

BUT WOULD IT NOT BE possible to organize the non-Communist nations of the world into some effective federation? The hard facts of international life speak strongly against the success of any such enterprise. The fundamental schism between the non-Communist nations and the Soviet bloc is not the only fission in the structure of the unhappily named "United Nations".

Colonialism is an intensely divisive issue, as recent close votes in the UN Assembly indicate. It is sheer utopianism to imagine that world government, by some inner magic, would create harmonious adjustment between the clashing views of French administrators and Moroccan and Tunisian nationalists, between Jews and Arabs, between Malan's "Apartheid" theory and South African native nationalist aspirations.

There is also the suggestion, vigorously advocated by Mr. Clarence Streit and supported by the organization, "Atlantic Union", to create a common government for the countries which qualify as democracies in the western understanding of that word. Such a proposal is more rational than the Chicago professor's pipedream of Americans and Canadians, Soviet Russians and Communist Chinese, Burmese and Bolivians all melting down their national sovereignties by some strange political alchemy, and forging the altar of a new god — world government.

But on balance, the defects of "Atlantic Union" outweigh the advantages. The need for an anti-Communist alliance between America and the European countries still outside the Iron Curtain, on a realistic basis of mutual interest, common security and reasonable equality of risk and sacrifice, is clear and unmistakable.

But an alliance is likely to function more smoothly and efficiently if it is restricted to basic essentials and is not cluttered up by the difficult extraneous questions which would arise as soon as there was an attempt to transform an alliance into a federation. Suppose, for example, that the United States and Great Britain should merge their economies and the accents of British, Scotch and Welsh members began to be heard in the halls of Congress. Given the present relative productivity of the two nations, one of the first results of all-around free trade would be the swamping of most British industries by American competitors, disastrous unemployment in Great Britain, perhaps a mass migration of Britons to the United States, which neither country would approve.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A closer union of the continental European nations is desirable and should be feasible. The proposals for a European Army and for a tariff-free European market for the coal, iron and steel industries are promising. But the issue of closer European federation still hangs perilously in the balance; the centrifugal tug of nationalist jealousies and antagonisms is still strong. The difficulties that have accompanied the attempts of two civilized, literate peoples like the Dutch and the Belgians to achieve such a modest goal as a full customs union should certainly give pause to those who think in terms of federating the whole world.

POLITICS IS THE ART OF THE possible, and the fundamental and final objection to world government is that it simply will not and cannot work in any conceivable future near enough to be worth planning or working for. Effective government, with consent of the governed, is possible only when patriotism has been nourished by a long tradition of shared national experience and when there is general acceptance of desirable standards in politics and economics, in law and ethics. One of the favorite slogans of the crusaders for world government is: "World law, to be applied not against states, but against individuals."

But this is fantastic nonsense for two reasons. *There is no world law today,* and it is useless to pretend that something exists when it does not. What is black on one side of the Iron Curtain is white on the other, and vice versa. What seems outrageous pillage and spoliation to the investor in Iranian oil or Bolivian tin seems just and proper to Iranian and Bolivian demogogic politicians, cheered on by howling mobs who make the foreigner the scapegoat for their poverty.

The idea of applying world law to individuals is also outside the realm of practical possibility. Suppose some phantom world authority issued a writ against a Soviet citizen who was running a slave labor camp, or against a Chinese official who had ordered a mass execution. Can anyone seriously suppose that such a writ could be executed?

If one takes a very optimistic view of the future, if one assumes that Communist expansive imperialism will somehow disappear, that the poorer nations of the world will succeed in raising appreciably their standards of living, some of the most obvious barriers to world government might be lowered or removed. But in such a case the danger of war would diminish and the need for world government would not be felt. The United States and Canada do not need a common government to keep the peace between themselves. And governments have made a mess of so many things that there is little reason to suppose that the world would fare better if a superstate were imposed on existing national states.

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. X, No. 11 Wednesday, March 18, 1953 Washington, D. C.

MAR 23 1953 LIBRARY

The State Department Way: It is a little-known fact, even within the discreet walls of the State Department, that one of its divisions, concerned with secret information, is headed by a man who only became an American citizen in the year 1940.

The division is called the Office of Intelligence Research, and its chief is Allan Evans. His biography in the State Department Directory lists him as born in England and naturalized in the United States in 1940. Mr. Evans may well be far more loyal to the country of his adoption than many native-born citizens. But good "security" practice in sensitive areas of the Government is to lean over backward, by selecting its hierarchy only from those born in this country of native parents.

Those who have cast a critical eye on this controversial section of the State Department are less concerned with Mr. Evans than they are with numerous other members of its staff. The saying goes about the Office of Intelligence Research, "There's not an American accent in the whole place", referring to the Eastern European origin of a number of staff members. In the State Department Directory some of these are listed without mention of birth places or dates of naturalization. It is believed that certain individuals who occupy positions of responsibility in this section not only came from Iron Curtain countries, but still have relatives living there — a "security" hazard which has made our hush-hush services extremely nervous.

In any case, it is being urged that this extraordinary division be transferred from the State Department to the Central Intelligence Agency which should properly clean it up or abolish it.

Encirclement: One of the reasons why such a situation as described above continues to exist is that there has been no cleanout of the State Department. The cause of this failure is well recognized by old hands in this most bureaucratic of all the departments. With wry humor they refer to it as "the encirclement of Lourie", meaning the new Undersecretary of State for Administration, Mr. Donald Lourie. A famous business executive (President of Quaker Oats Company), Mr. Lourie has had difficulties in getting under way.

It is said that the Undersecretary — whose intentions are the best — is aware that little progress has been made and is conscious that something is wrong. What is wrong is that he is "surrounded" by former aides of Dean Acheson. One principal assistant comes directly from the secretariat which served in Acheson's own office; another worked for Acheson's Security chief, Carlisle Humelsine. Both are young men who came into the State Department after the war and never knew the State Department when it was run by Hull and his conservative diplomats. Gossip in the Department is to the effect that these men were actually — although privately — supporters of Governor Stevenson in last fall's campaign. Gossip also relates that there are a number of "pipelines" between the State Department and the Democratic National Committee Headquarters.

[Walter Trohan in the *Chicago Tribune*, March 11, reports that Lourie did dodge one trap. On arrival at his desk, he found that he had been assigned as an office secretary, a famous stenographer, Miss Vernice Anderson. Miss Anderson is famous because she is the lady who hid behind a door of the hut on Wake Island when MacArthur and Truman held their historic meeting in 1951. Miss Anderson later confessed to having taken stenographic notes of what was said, "automatically". Trohan reports: "Lourie refused to accept her because he felt he did not know when she might remember her automatic writing and where she might send her information . . ."]

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The problem in the State Department — unlike other parts of the Executive branch — is "encirclement", not Civil Service. The town is buzzing over proposals to remove Civil Service protection from many obvious political "holdovers" from the Democratic regime, so as to allow the various new Department heads to have Republican staffs. But that is not the problem in the State Department. The State Department has unlimited power to fire anyone, whether under Civil Service or not. This power was given to State (and to that department alone) by legislation passed in 1947. It has been used rarely, but it is expected that such chiefs as Mr. Lourie may very soon have to use it — and drastically.

Alarums and Excursions: The apparently confusing policy of Malenkov — first shooting down our planes, then talking of peace parleys — is no mystery to Isaac Don Levine, former editor of *Plain Talk* and specialist on Russia. He warned, on the first news of Stalin's illness two weeks ago, that a new Russian regime would seek to obtain a temporary peace settlement, under a "mask of truculence".

● Pentagon sources say that the military some time ago produced a psychological warfare plan to be used against Soviet Russia in case Stalin died. The plan was submitted to the State Department and assigned to its Russian expert, "Chip" Bohlen, for study. The diplomat "sat on it" and nothing was done when the news of Stalin's death appeared. Bohlen has faced some Congressional opposition to his confirmation as Ambassador to Russia because of his defense of the Yalta deal.

Cold War Strategist: The appointment of Mr. C. D. Jackson, former *Time* and *Fortune* executive, as psychological warfare adviser in the White House has stirred no little criticism among observers in the Capital. The question most frequently asked in Washington during the past fortnight has been — "Why doesn't the Administration exploit the world situation arising from the death of Stalin?"

One answer is that the Voice of America, designed for such an emergency, has long been woefully ineffective. Senator Taft, on March 15, voiced the reaction of Congress when he called for abolition of the present Voice operation and creation of an entirely new propaganda organization.

Jackson has been so recently appointed that less blame is attached to him for present inaction. However, his record as former head of Radio Free Europe, a privately financed organization created to wage psychological warfare across the Iron Curtain, has raised grave doubts as to his fitness for his new job in the White House.

Radio Free Europe is supposed to fight Communism with propaganda. Presumably this group, headed by Jackson, would employ only proven anti-Communists who could speak with conviction, so as to affect the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Dr. Kurt Glaser, writing in the February issue of *National Republic*, produces a disturbing picture of the Czechs and Slovaks whom Jackson hired to write, edit, produce and broadcast the propaganda of Radio Free Europe. These employees, says Glaser, "are no more anti-Communist than Mrs. O'Leary's cow was a giraffe: they themselves sold Czechoslovakia down the river to the Communists."

Glaser charges, with a wealth of documentation, that this Jackson group (1) is infested with Communist agents and that it betrays anti-Communists within Czechoslovakia to the Red secret police; (2) that their political line promotes hatred and rivalry between European peoples, thereby assisting the Soviet Union; and (3) with the help of State Department friends, they have stacked immigration procedures to help left-wingers get into the United States and to keep out real anti-Communists.

The facts, as Glaser states them, seem incontrovertible. The conclusions drawn are: (1) that Jackson was extraordinarily ignorant or careless in allowing this group to operate; and (2) his record in this case scarcely justifies his appointment as psychological warfare "Pooh-Bah" in the White House.

Rabbi Silver: Republican members of Congress have taken notice, with dismay, of certain utterances of Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver. This clergyman has been popularly classified as close to President Eisen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hower and Senator Taft. The utterances of Silver concern the Soviet Union and its developing anti-Jewish policy.

The *New Leader* published an editorial (February 16) recalling that Silver was quoted as saying "that he could not 'believe' that the Russians and Czech Communist regimes would indulge in anti-semitism, and urged that we await proof until we condemn these 'friends'." This statement, the *New Leader* reminds us, was given front page prominence by the Communist *Daily Worker* of New York. More recently, Silver returned to the subject of Soviet "anti-semitism". He said, "It is not too late for some authoritative statement or act on the part of the highest Soviet leadership to clarify the situation, set the record straight, relieve the minds of fear and suspicion." The *New Leader* — and others — find Dr. Silver's reactions "peculiar".

Inside Britain: *Whitehall Window*, a newsletter published in London, on March 13 ran a story from which one may draw the conclusion that Messrs. Eden and Butler encountered resistance from U.S. officials in their "raid" on Washington. "The British plan", says the London publication, "was originally based on the assumption that the U.S. and Canada would provide a stabilization fund, but this is now out of the question, and it was temporarily decided in Washington that Britain would make greater use than before of the International Monetary Fund. It may mean that the Charter of the International Monetary Fund may have to be revised, which could only be done with U.S. approval."

The same issue also reports the interesting news that Churchill "was profoundly grieved by Stalin's illness and death. It is, perhaps, not generally realized, but it is a fact that Mr. Churchill always liked Stalin — in a way. The Prime Minister, incidentally, believes that we may soon witness the beginning of a new Soviet diplomatic offensive designed to bring about a meeting between Mr. Churchill, President Eisenhower and Mr. Malenkov."

Education Front: A bill before the Indiana General Assembly, introduced by Representative Philip Johnson, reads in part as follows: "That the Congress of the United States should refrain from enacting legislation which would provide a federal subsidy for general public education, therefore opening the way for federal control and supervision of a function that is clearly the responsibility of state and local government."

The Indiana Parent-Teacher Association (Mrs. Frederick S. Ballweg, Secretary) is urging its membership to press for the passage of this resolution. This is quite at variance with the tendency of PTA groups in general to go along with the organized hierarchy of the teaching fraternity. Evidently the Indiana PTA is not under the domination of the National Education Association, which for years has been urging federalization of the public schools through subsidization.

The letter of the Indiana PTA to its members also calls attention to a bill before the state Senate which makes it a punishable misdemeanor for a principal, superintendent or other supervisor to coerce teachers into joining either the State Teachers Association or the National Education Association. The letter goes on to say that the organization has received a "tremendous response" from teachers all over the state, expressing their dislike of the pressure put upon them to join an organization in which they had no voice, and objecting to the paying of dues "to an organization which is trying to further a socialistic program".

The rest of the country would be indebted to the ladies of the Indiana PTA if they made public the recipes of the "states rights" and individualistic dishes on which they thrive.

Addendum: From an editorial in *The Indianapolis Star* we learn that principals are informing teachers who do not join the Indiana State Teachers Association that they will "lose two days' pay for the time schools are closed for ISTA meetings". The threat is not an idle one; in Indiana, organization dues are deducted from teachers' pay checks.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Asia Aflame: Communism in the East, by Ebed Van der Vlugt. New York: Devin-Adair. $6.00.
Reviewed by John Chamberlain.

Almost from the very beginning of the Bolshevik Revolution, the Soviets have been "Asia Firsters". But it has taken thirty-five years to get this through the heads of American statesmen, and even now our John Foster Dulleses seem not too certain on alternate weeks about the primacy of Asia in Bolshevik thinking. All the more reason, then, to welcome Ebed Van der Vlugt's *Asia Aflame: Communism in the East,* which comes to us with a shrewd introduction by General Albert C. Wedemeyer. Dr. Van der Vlugt, a native of Holland, has spent a good part of his life in the Dutch East Indies, and he seems to know that territory as thoroughly as a Paris street apache knows the back alleys of Montmartre.

Asia Aflame is an encyclopedic roundup of the Orient, and there are chapters in it, notably those on Indo-China and Indonesia, that carry a freight of information that will come as virgin news to most Americans. But the real importance of the book lies in its appreciation of the eastward orientation of Soviet foreign policy under Lenin and Stalin. Karl Marx, as is well known, always thought that the Communistic revolution would sweep through the technologically advanced nations before striking the "backward" peoples of Asia and Africa. But Lenin, the schoolmasterly Bolshevik from the Volga valley, proved to be more Asiatic than Marxian in his thinking of Russia's place in the world. After the failure of the German and Hungarian revolutions, Lenin conceived the idea of breaking the West by subverting the East. This would rob Western Europe and America of colonial possessions and sources of raw materials, and it would break into the international market economy of capitalism sufficiently to cause a permanent crisis. Trotsky, the ideologue, systematized the thinking of Lenin on Asia by formulating "the law of uneven and combined development". By this Trotsky meant that colonial lands could combine their bourgeois-nationalist and their Communist revolutions into one quick mutation into Communism.

Van der Vlugt shows how the Lenin-Trotsky formula worked out on the plane of practical Soviet politics. He puts great stress on the Baku Congress of Eastern Peoples, called by Lenin as far back as the Autumn of 1920, just three months after the Bolsheviks had seized the Caucasus. Almost two thousand delegates, most of them full-fledged Communist agents, came to Baku from Turkey, Persia, Armenia, the Arabian peninsula, India, China and Japan. Zinoviev set the pitch for thirty years of Bolshevik thinking when he pointed out to the Baku crowds that "there are four times as many peoples living in Asia as live in Europe". And Lenin summed it up in a capsule: "The East will one day put an end to the West."

Even more than Louis Fischer's famous *The Soviets in World Affairs,* Ebed Van der Vlugt's book shows how the theme of the Baku conference has run through Soviet expansion history. Stalin always thought of eastern Europe as a *glacis* to protect Muscovy from invasion. But China was another matter: he wanted China in order to take Southeast Asia and the Indies. Van der Vlugt gives cogent histories of the Red attack on all the lands of Asia. His book is definitely superior reporting.

Asia Aflame was written before the ascension of Malenkov, who knows even less about the West than Stalin knew. Risking a prophecy, I should say that this makes Van der Vlugt more important than ever.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED